DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 498 CS 005 048

AUTHOR Jund, Suzanne, Ed.
TITLE Theme: Reading in the Content Areas.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Reading Association, West Allis.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 55p.
JOURNAL CIT Wisconsin State Reading Association Journal; v24 n1 Sep 1979

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; *Bibliotherapy; *Childrens Literature; Elementary Secondary Education; Gifted; *Handicapped Students; *Individualized Instruction; Individualized Reading; Mainstreaming; Mentally Handicapped; Physically Handicapped; *Reading Instruction; Reading Research; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

The five articles in this journal issue focus on reading instruction for atypical learners. The topics covered are: defining the atypical student, developing qualitatively different reading programs for gifted students, bibliotherapy for the atypical reader, helping students confronted with mainstreaming develop understanding of the handicapped through children's literature (a reading list is included), and the treatment of the handicapped in adolescent fiction. Regular journal features include an argument for the use of research in administering reading programs, a discussion of parental involvement with accelerated learners, a research update on individual differences in reading ability, a list of resouces for teachers to use with atypical students, a review of professional materials, and a newsletter from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED177498

WISCONSIN STATE READING ASSOCIATION JOURNAL

Volume 24 Number 1

September, 1979

Theme: Reading in the Content Areas

Ms. Suzanne Jund
General Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wisconsin State Reading Association
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS005048

WISCONSIN STATE READING ASSOCIATION JOURNAL

Volume 24 Number 1
September, 1979

Theme: Reading in the Content Areas

CONTENTS

	Page
President's Message	2
ARTICLES:	
"With All Due Respect..." by John D. Stammer	3
Rationale for Developing Qualitatively Different Reading Programs for Gifted Elementary School Students by Gary W. Bates	6
Bibliotherapy for the Atypical Reader by Gary A. Negin	12
Mainstreaming: Developing Understanding of the Handicapped Through Children's Literature by Carol J. Hopkins	17
The Treatment of the Handicapped in Adolescent Fiction by Janet G. Stroud	22
REGULAR FEATURES:	
Administering Reading Programs: Using Research by Mildred Hoffmann	28
Parents' Spot: Parent Involvement With Accelerated Learners by Jean McEwen Milfred	35
Research Update: Individual Differences in Reading Ability by Douglas Vance	41
Resources for Teachers by Hilda C. Baumgartner	46
Professional Materials on Review by James L. Raabe	48
DPI Reading Newsline by Ellen Ryan	50
From the Editor	52

President's Message

Good news! Children are reading better today than they were in the "good old days." If you haven't read Roger Farr's testimony in the News and Views, please take a moment and do so. Share it with others.

At the WSRA leadership meeting in July at Stevens Point, committees were given their charges and are actively pursuing their implementation. Before that, Mel Yanow, Roger Quealy and I spent a few busy days in St. Louis at a leadership meeting hosted by the IRA. It enabled us to get together with the Great Lakes and Great Plains States and share ideas and concerns.

One of my goals as president is to improve communications between the membership, officers and committees. A second goal is to set up the groundwork so that in a few years there will be a much expanded program committee since our Spring conference is growing so rapidly. A third goal is to increase membership at the local, state, and national levels. Whether these goals will be attainable depends upon YOU!

I wish you a wonderful school year and ask for your support for WSRA.

Dave Gustafson
President

PRESIDENT
Dr. David Gustafson
410 Nolop Road
LaCrosse, WI 54601

VICE PRESIDENT
Mr. Mel Yanow
9019 N. Santa Monica Blvd.
Bayside, WI 53217

VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT
Mr. Douglas Vance
1822 Van Hise Avenue
Madison, WI 53705

CORRESPONDING SECRETARY
Mrs. Judith Casey
400 S. Silverlake St.
Oconomowoc, WI 53066

RECORDING SECRETARY
Mrs. Maybelle Adashun
R.R. 2, Box 205
Campbellsport, WI 53010

TREASURER
Ms. Laura Holmgren
13521 W. Greenfield Ave.
New Berlin, WI 53151

STATE COORDINATOR
Dr. Roger Quealy
2805 Rudolph Road
Eau Claire, WI 54701

GENERAL EDITOR
Ms. Suzanne Jund
1122 South 115 Street
West Allis, WI 53214

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
Mrs. Hilda Baumgartner
Dr. Sandra Dahl
Mrs. Mildren Hoffmann
Dr. James Raabe
Mr. Douglas Vance

ASSISTANT EDITORS
Mrs. Melva Kleist
Mrs. Margaret Lokken
Ms. Ellen Ryan

ADVERTISING MANAGER
Mr. Paul Majerle
1144 Romin Road
Lake Geneva, WI 53147

Copyright 1979, Wisconsin State Reading Association, 1122 South 115 Street, West Allis, WI 53214.

The Wisconsin State Reading Association Journal is published four times during the academic year in October, January, March, and May and is the official publication of the Wisconsin State Reading Association. Subscriptions are included with the $6.50 yearly membership fee. A special reduced fee of $3.50 is charged for retired professionals, full time students, and parents.

BACK COPIES may be obtained from the Editor for $2.00 each post paid.

Correspondence on editorial matters and manuscripts may be sent to the WSRA Journal Editor.

Guest Editorial

"WITH ALL DUE RESPECT..."

by

John D. Stammer
Professor
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

It is usually fun to look over the thematic scope of the future issues of any professional journal. One may sit and think (if the time is available) and ponder the likelihood of a published piece that addresses one or another of the theme topics.

So it was when I received information about future issues of the Wisconsin State Reading Association Journal. I perused the themes and sadly dismissed each topic for one reason or another. My eye wandered back (an obvious regression) to the first theme, "Reading instruction and the atypical learner." I noted the parenthetical part of the theme; the emphasis on gifted, adult, LD, EMR, English as a second language, etc. The 'etc.' began to make me itch.

"Exactly what would the 'etc.' be?" I wondered aloud. "Who is an atypical reader? Conversely, who is a typical reader?"

With all due respect, how many 'typical' readers does the average classroom have? With the exception

of the mysterious 'etc.' group, the atypical reader is neatly classified and most classrooms have but few of these identified types as a part of their student population.

Still, most classroom teachers would quickly suggest that a majority of their students were 'atypical' learners. Some children advance almost like clockwork through the reading program (presumably demonstrating this growth with scores consistently at the fifty-first percentile); others progress, if at all, laboriously; and still a third group is bored by it all, often with justification.

From a human perspective it would seem that if the teacher is to address the problem of effective reading instruction for the 'atypical' learner, then the time would be well spent in considering the needs of the child who is not learning well, has mastered the material, or is progressing at an average pace but has potential greater than his or her achievement.

"Ahh," you say, "another exhortation to individualize instruction in the classroom."

Of course. If one is to progress beyond lip-service to the individual needs of children, it is essential that some form of individualizing take place. Notwithstanding the fact that classrooms may include LD, EMR, Gifted, or second language English speakers and that programs do have to be designed to meet their needs, so too must the unique needs of each individual child be met. There are a substantial number of 'et cetera' children in every classroom and to worry only incidentally about reading instruction for them is a classic example of instructional oversight.

I have the suspicion that other papers in this issue will address the "How" of meeting the needs of specifically identified atypical learners and to suggest that such papers are without merit is without foundation. I do ask, however, that the teacher make an objective assessment of the readers in his or her classroom and (perhaps) list children in suggested categories. The idea is to include in the system of classification categories other than gifted, LD, and the like and to add such headings as, "unchallenged by the material," "frustrated," "bored," "hates reading," "disinterested," and finally "average."

On reflection, an easier way to accomplish this classification would perhaps be to simply have one category: "Average." Children not listed here might correctly be considered atypical, as having unique and special needs. Very likely this list will be extremely short and will demonstrate that the typical classroom has few typical learners.

The point then, at the risk of redundance, is to recognize that children being taught to read are largely atypical learners and, as such, require the individual attention of the teacher from a diagnostic and instructional perspective if the teacher is to do more than allow their progress in learning to read to stagnate.

****

Rationale for Developing Qualitatively Different Reading Programs for Gifted Elementary School Students

by

Gary W. Bates
Lecturer
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin--Madison

Kurt Vonnegut, Jr. (1950) satirized the fear of the gifted in the short story, "Harrison Bergeron." In this story everyone was required by law to be equal in all ways. Equality was accomplished through the use of mental and physical handicaps which people who were more intelligent, strong, or beautiful than the norm were required to wear at all times. Those who failed to wear their handicaps were punished by imprisonment or death. However, the average people were still envious and fearful of their more gifted peers.

Such envy and fear of the gifted has been and continues to be one of the major sources of opposition to the development of qualitatively different programs, materials, and teaching methods for gifted children. A brief examination of the history of the movement for differentiated education for the gifted will describe how the opposition developed.

In the 1920's Lewis Terman and others (1925) established intelligence as the criterion for identification of gifted students. An opposition movement, charging aintidemocracy and elitism, immediately arose to counter programming for the gifted, and it has fought such programming over the past fifty years. Because of this opposition, the movement for qualitatively different programs for gifted students has had periods of growth followed by periods of complete neglect.

A growth spurt came after the

A growth spurt came after the U.S.S.R. launched Sputnik I in October, 1957. There was a massive effort by the federal government and educational systems to develop programming for gifted students in the areas of science and mathematics. Who would dare charge that the special programs were undemocratic when their aim was beating the Russians to the moon? However, while there was little public resistance, there was also little public support for the programs which were developed.

A blow to proponents of programming for gifted students came in 1966 with the publication of The Effects of Ability Grouping by Miriam Goldberg and A. Harry Passow. In the study three thousand fifth graders in forty-five schools were organized into fifteen grouping patterns based upon five levels of ability. The findings indicated that the effects of ability grouping were minimal.

What proponents and opponents alike overlook, however, is the fact that Goldberg and Passow made no attempt to control or examine the content or methods of instruction--all they did was compare a number of schools which either had a variety of grouping patterns or none at all. Since ability grouping per se has never been the aim of those interested in qualitatively different programs for gifted students, one would think Goldberg and Passow's study would have little relation to and effect on such programs. However, their study is still being used, frequently by sophisticated and intelligent educators, as "evidence" against differentiated programming for gifted students.

The current interest in programming for the gifted was stimulated by the 1971 report to Congress on the education of the gifted and talented by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The report listed six areas of giftedness: general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, visual and performing arts, and psychomotor ability. The trend since 1971 has been to broaden the definition of giftedness to include as many areas of talent as possible. Despite this blurring of definition the charges of antidemocracy and elitist education continue. But, interestingly, it is usually programs that are designed for students gifted with general intellectual ability and specific academic aptitude that bear the brunt of the criticism.

One is forced to ask why it is that intellectual and academic ability incurs the hostility and fear of the public. Does the public fear that their own or their children's intellectual ability is common, ordinary, inferior? On the other hand, why doesn't the public object to programming for students with athletic, musical, artistic, dramatic, and leadership abilities? The answer lies in the mythology surrounding American public education. Public education has long been seen as the great equalizer through which the poor and uneducated can hope to obtain a better life for their children. It's the "any boy can grow up to be president" myth, which was, perhaps, started by the claim that "all men are created equal."

Since schools have been concerned with reading, writing, and arithmetic, it is perhaps unavoidable that intellectual ability and academic aptitude have come to be considered the result of education. Given the belief in education as an equalizer, it is easy to see how people began to believe that anyone could achieve the same intellectual ability as anyone else as long as the education was the same. Conversely, people did not see athletic, musical, and artistic instruction as primary functions of education.

It is clear that the anti-intellectualism that seems to be pervasive in American society today has its roots in the social and political history of this country and is the basis for the arguments against programming for gifted students. A person with high intellectual ability threatens the myth that education equalizes all other factors. If this sacred fantasy is to be maintained, then nothing must be done to encourage anyone to excell beyond the reach of the average. "The gifted student will make it anyway."

The problem remains how to deal with such pervasive and deep-rooted hostility against programming for gifted students. The solution is to refute the charge that programs for the gifted are undemocratic.

The trend in education in recent years has been to provide differentiated programming for students with different needs. Disadvantaged students, slow learners, learning disabled, emotionally disturbed, and physically and mentally handicapped have highly developed educational programs. None has been criticized as being undemocratic. How can it be

undemocratic to differentiate programming for gifted students' unique learning needs? There is no legal nor rational justification for discrimination against these students and recourse through the courts may be required to force school systems to make accommodations for gifted students.

If people can be convinced that it is not undemocratic to program for gifted students, the charge of elitism still remains. Perhaps an analogy to athletic, musical, artistic, and dramatic abilities will provide more insight. It is hard to imagine the head coach of an athletic team choosing players regardless of their abilities, or an art teacher submitting for a national art competition a work chosen at random from students' products, or a drama coach picking a cast with no regard for acting ability. It is not expected that they should, for if they did the result would be the world of "Harrison Bergeron" that Vonnegut (1950) envisioned.

The fact is that for years special programs have been provided for students who are talented in athletics, music, art, and drama--and few have questioned them as elitist or useless. In truth, there seems to be a general acceptance that these students can develop their potential only with the competition and stimulation of their peers and the best possible training and teaching possible. Why isn't the same also true of intellectually and academically gifted students? The point seems obvious.

If the obstacles to programming for gifted students can be overcome, the logical question is where to begin. The answer is reading instruction. There is, in fact, support for grouping students by ability for reading instruction in spite of the type of teaching methods or materials. This support comes from none other than Goldberg and Passow (1966) who found that reading was the only subject area for which narrow range ability grouping proved to be superior to medium and broad range grouping. This seemingly minor result of their study is overlooked because they reported their findings across subject areas which eliminated the distinction between reading and the other academic subjects.

Since reading is both a tool for the acquisition of knowledge and a productive recreational activity, it is crucial for gifted students if they

are to develop to their potential. Further, early learning, rapidity in learning, verbal precocity (Witty, 1971) and early reading (Durkin, 1966) have been shown to be frequent early indicators of giftedness and should therefore be nurtured.

The usual fare of reading instruction in the primary and intermediate grades is neither instructive nor stimulating for gifted students. (Spache & Spache, 1977) The "basal approach" is used by "95 to 98 percent of primary teachers and at least 80 percent of intermediate-grade teachers...every school day." (Spache & Spache, 1977) Although they have improved in the last decade, most basal readers still use stilted language forms, controlled vocabulary, and stories that are isolated from children's experiences and interests. (Spache & Spache, 1977)

In order to maintain and develop interests and to accommodate the accelerated learning pace of gifted students an individualized approach to reading instruction is suggested in place of formal instruction with a basal series.

The regular procedures for using individualized reading--e.g., learning centers, grouping for skills development by aptitude, grouping by interest, and conferences for guidance, diagnosis, and record keeping--should be maintained. Gifted students benefit especially from individualized reading which allows them to:

1. proceed at their own accelerated pace,
2. develop a positive relationship with the teacher,
3. experience success and improve self-esteem,
4. be responsible for selecting their own reading materials,
5. develop new and varied interests, and
6. discuss their reading with the teacher and other gifted students.

The realization that very little has been accomplished in fifty years supports the need to call for the development of programs for the gifted--especially in the crucial area of reading instruction. The reasons for the lack of progress by educational systems in programming for gifted students are complex and intertwined with the history of the

movement calling for such change. However, if schools or school systems are interested in beginning some type of programming for gifted students, there could be no better way to start than by establishing a qualitatively different reading program for their gifted elementary school students.

References

Durkin, D. Children who read early. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.

Goldberg, M. and Passow, A.H. The effects of ability grouping. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1966.

Spache, G.D. and Spache, E.B. Reading in the elementary school (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1977.

Terman, L.M., et al. Genetic studies of genius (6 vols.). Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1925-1968

U.S. Office of Education. Education of the gifted and talented, Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Washington, D.C.: Editors of Education U.S.A., 1971.

Vonnegut, K. Jr. Harrison Bergeron. In K. Vonnegut Jr. Welcome to the monkey house. New York: Dell, 1950.

Witty, P.A. Characteristics of gifted and creative pupils and their needs for reading experiences. In P.A. Witty (Ed.), Reading for the gifted and the creative student. Newark, Del.: IRA, 1971.

Bibliotherapy for the Atypical Reader

by

Gary A. Negin
Assistant Professor
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Words--sympathy, desecrate, tranquility, holocaust, tenderness, abortion, chalice, rape, myrrh, obliterate, gossamer, censure, affectionate, castigate, compassion, devastation--Emotions.

Stories--dancing with Baryshnikov to the delight of ballet audiences, shaking with fear as enemy bombers attack, scoring the winning touchdown in the Super Bowl game, suffering the loss of a beloved friend, accompanying Lindbergh on his historic Atlantic flight, fleeing Atlanta as Sherman's army approaches--Experiences.

Since stories are made of words, the experiences they describe stimulate emotion. Well written stories grab the attention of a reader, allow him to vicariously share events and feelings, and teach. Good writing teaches best when it is not dogmatic. It teaches best when it suggests attractive alternative attitudes, roles, or behaviors to an emotionally involved reader.

Educators have historically tried to provide knowledge and guidance for growth through reading. For example, Aeschylus called words "physicians" and the library at Thebes in ancient Greece bore the inscription, "Healing Place of the Soul." The process of helping students cope with the environment, with others, and with themselves through reading is called bibliotherapy.

The Psychological Process

The most thorough explanation of the psychological process involved in bibliotherapy is provided by Shrodes (1949, 1955). She describes three

phases: identification, catharsis, and insight.

Through identification, the reader realizes the similarity between his predicament or emotion and that of a character in the story. This motivates the reader to care about what happens to the story character. The reader is attached and involved. Catharsis, a release of tension, is possible because the reader controls his thoughts and reactions and is not threatened by outside influences. Catharsis clears the mind and allows insights to develop. Insights, new perspectives, develop when the reader arrives at a new solution after vicariously re-experiencing a personal conflict through literature.

Materials for the Atypical Reader

Bibliotherapy is most effective when there is a careful match between a vivid story and the needs and reading ability of the reader. Fortunately, educators have access to numerous book selection aids. (For example, see Huck, 1976; and Sutherland and Arbuthnot, 1977.) These general aids, however, are not convenient for teachers who must choose books that have special meaning for the atypical reader. It is recommended that the following selected references be examined:

1. The Book Finder: A Guide to Children's Literature About the Needs and Problems of Youth Aged 2-15. Sharon Dreyer, Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, 1977.

   This book was written especially for use with bibliotherapy. It contains an annotated list of 1,031 books, a subject index, an author index, a title index, and a publishers directory. The 1,031 books are categorized into approximately 450 topics which cover a broad range of needs and problems.

2. Notes From a Different Drummer: A Guide to Juvenile Fiction Portraying The Handicapped. Barbara Baskin and Karen Harris, New York: R. Bowker Company, 1977.

   Three hundred and eleven books published between 1940 and 1975 are listed by the author's name. There is a title index and a subject index which are helpful in locating books that pertain to a particular impairment. Each book's annotation includes a plot description, the level of reading difficulty, and an analysis of the interpretive and literary treatment.

3. Books to Help Children Cope with Separation and Loss. Joanne Bernstein, New York: R. Bowker Company, 1977.

   This reference is an annotated bibliography of 438 books. The volume also includes author, title, subject, interest level, and reading level indices. Books are categorized by the type of separation and loss problem.

4. Bibliotherapy Reference Guide. Detroit, Michigan: We The Handicapped, n.d.

   Four hundred and fifty-five books concerning the physically disabled are listed with synopses. Books are classified by disability, as factual or fictional, and as adult or juvenile.

5. Reading Ladders for Human Relations. Virginia Reid, Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1972.

   This annotated bibliography of more than 1,300 books is divided into sections on creating a positive self-image, living with others, coping with change, and appreciating different cultures. Books are arranged within sections by maturity level.

6. "Bibliotherapy for Handicapped Children," Edith Cohoe, N.E.A. Journal, 1960, 49, 34-36.

   This article provides a short list of children's books for handicapped students. The availability of Braille editions is noted.

Suggestions for Conducting Bibliotherapy

Even though bibliotherapy can be used as a preventive or corrective measure, there are three reasons why it should never be considered a component of the basic instructional reading program. First, bibliotherapy will be most effective when students are inclined to take the initiative for their own growth. This means that suitable books should be gently recommended and not required. Books should not be administered "for the student's own good" like a substantial dose of cod liver oil. Second, responses to literature aren't as generalizable as the effects of medicine. In some instances a text may not have the predicted salutary effect. A reader may become more self-conscious and even resentful when he reads

about the virtuous behavior of a character with similar problems. Third, if the text is perceived as a mundane assignment like workbook pages or textbook readings, the experience is likely to be less pleasurable. It is essential for students to discover that reading can be a source of enjoyment and valuable information, if lifetime reading habits are to be developed.

When students are willing to participate, it is often helpful if students and teachers discuss the readings. It is advisable to meet with a student individually if highly personal matters are to be covered or if the student is extremely sensitive. Groups allow students to learn from each other, since a successful group openly shares feelings and insights. Students also receive emotional support from other group members and take comfort in knowing that their problems are not unique or unnatural.

Whether conferences are held with individuals or groups, the following discussion format should be used: 1) a student briefly reviews the plot, 2) questions are asked which probe the key character's thoughts and actions, 3) students compare and contrast incidents in their lives to events involving the key character, 4) the students explore the consequences of certain behaviors, and 5) a student summarizes and concludes.

The teacher's role in group discussions is to be the leader. This does not mean, however, that the teacher should dominate or preach. A good group leader is prepared to accept a variety of responses, foster interaction among group members, diagnose the group's needs, encourage quiet students to express themselves, keep discussions from deteriorating, and provide factual information when necessary.

Conclusion

Bibliotherapy should be considered as an adjunct to other types of helping relationships, particularly for students with serious problems. Yet, when a sympathetic, observant teacher utilizes the power of the written word and its ability to expand horizons through vicarious experience, atypical readers can be greatly helped in learning to cope with the demands of being human.

References

Huck, C. Children's literature in the elementary school. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976, 769-779.

Shrodes, C. The responses of adolescents to literature involving selected experiences of personal development. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1949.

Shrodes, C. Bibliotherapy. Reading Teacher, 1955, 9, 24-29.

Sutherland, Z. and Arbuthnot, M. Children and books. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1977, 628-632.

Mainstreaming: Developing Understanding of the Handicapped Through Children's Literature

by
Carol J. Hopkins
Assistant Professor of Education
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

The enactment of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, otherwise known as Public Law 94-142, has placed new demands on our educational system as provisions for meeting the special needs of the handicapped children who represent ten to twelve percent of the school-age population in the United States are implemented. The provision for the "least restrictive environment" has opened the regular classroom to many handicapped children for the fulfillment of part or most of their academic, emotional and social needs.

Many educators are finding themselves in the position of needing to provide accurate information about handicaps to help prepare nonhandicapped children for the experience of interacting with disabled children in the classroom. Should the teacher look to existing classroom materials for help, he or she will find, as did Jaffe (1977) and Hopkins (1979), that there is a noticeable lack of representation of handicapped individuals in educational materials (i.e., textbooks) used in elementary school classrooms today. Fortunately, there are a number of recent, accurate, well-written trade books available on the topic of the handicapped. At the elementary level, current books available about handicapped children fall into the categories of blindness, deafness, physical handicaps, and mental retardation. The following bibliography includes books in each of these four disability categories.

Blindness

Gill, T. Tom Sullivan's adventures in darkness. New York: McKay, 1976.

Litchfield, A. A cane in her hand. Chicago: Whitman, 1977.

Little J. From Anna. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Parker, M. Horses, airplanes and frogs. Elgin, Illinois: The Child's World, 1977.

Peterson, P. Sally can't see. New York: John Day, 1974.

Wolf, B. Connie's new eyes. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1976.

Wosmek, F. A bowl full of sun. Chicago: Children's Press, 1976.

Deafness

Arthur, C. My sister's silent world. Chicago: Children's Press, 1979.

Levine, E. Lisa and her soundless world. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1974.

Litchfield, A. A button in her ear. Chicago: Albert Whitman, 1976.

Peter, D. Claire and Emma. New York: John Day, 1977.

Peterson, J. I have a sister, my sister is deaf. New York: Harper and Row, 1977.

Wolf, B. Anna's silent world. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1977.

Physical Handicaps

Berger, G. Physical disabilities. New York: Franklin Watts, 1979.

Fanshawe, E. Rachel. Scarsdale, New York: Bradbury Press, 1975.

Fassler, J. Howie helps himself. Chicago: Whitman, 1975.

Henriod, L. Special Olympics and Paralympics. New York: Franklin Watts, 1979.

Kamien, J. What if you couldn't...? A book about special needs. New York: Scribner, 1979.

Mack, N. Tracy. Chicago: Children's Press, 1976.

Pursell, B. A look at physical handicaps. Minneapolis: Lerner Publications, 1976.

Robinet, H. Jay and the marigold. Chicago: Children's Press, 1976.

Stein, S. About handicaps. New York: Walker, 1976.

Sullivan, M.B., Brightman, A. and Blatt, J. Feeling free. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

White, P. Janet at school. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1978.

Wolf, B. Don't feel sorry for Paul. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1974.

Mental Retardation

Anders, R. A look at mental retardation. Minneapolis: Lerner Publications, 1976.

Baldwin, A. A little time. New York: Viking, 1978.

Brightman, A. Like me. Boston: Little, Brown 1976.

Byars, B. The summer of the swans. New York: Viking, 1970.

Christopher, M. Long shot for Paul. Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.

Crane, C. A girl like Tracy. New York: McKay, 1966.

Dunbar, E. Mental retardation (A first book). New York: Franklin Watts, 1978.

Fassler, J. One little girl. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Friis-Baastad, B. Don't take Teddy. New York: Scribner, 1967.

Gold, P. Please don't say hello. New York: Human Sciences Press, 1975.

Hirsch, K. My sister. Carolrhoda Books, 1977.

Klein, G. The blue rose. Lawrence Hill, 1974.

Larsen, H. Don't forget Tom. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1974.

Ominsky. E. Jon O: A special boy. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Parker, M. He is your brother. Nelson, 1976.

Rodowsky, C. What about me? New York: Franklin Watts, 1976.

Shyer, M. Welcome home, Jellybean. New York: Scribner, 1978.

Sobol, H. My brother Steven is retarded. New York: Macmillan, 1977.

Wrightson, P. A racecourse for Andy. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968.

Miscellaneous

Christopher, M. Glue fingers. Boston: Little, Brown, 1975. (stuttering)

Berger, G. Learning disabilities and handicaps. New York: Franklin Watts, 1978. (learning disabilities)

Lasker, J. He's my brother. Chicago: Whitman, 1974. (learning disabilities)

Since recent research by Monson and Shurtleff (1979) has shown that the use of media can influence children's attitudes toward handicapped individuals, especially when teachers provide good models and encourage positive attitudes, it seems especially important that educators be aware of such resources and use them in their classrooms.

References

Hopkins, C. J. "Treatment of the handicapped in elementary reading materials," paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Reading Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April, 1979.

Jaffe, J. F. "The hidden minorities: Sex and race are not enough," paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers

of English, New York, November, 1977.

Monson, D. and Shurtleff, C. "Altering attitudes toward the physically handicapped through print and non-print media." Language Arts 56 (February 1979): 163-170.

****

The Treatment of the Handicapped in Adolescent Fiction

by

Janet G. Stroud
Assistant Professor, Media Sciences
Purdue University
West Lafayette, Indiana

As a result of Public Law 94-142, educators are presently faced with the challenge of helping the handicapped adjust to a new and perhaps frightening setting, and helping the nonhandicapped adjust to them being there, a process which is going to require a great deal of understanding on everyone's part. Unfortunately, understanding does not occur overnight; it is more often a painstakingly slow process.

One of the ways in which understanding and acceptance can be fostered is through the use of fictional materials. Hopefully, as understanding increases, feelings of prejudice will decrease. In the area of adolescent fiction, there have been some excellent novels available in the past which portrayed handicapped characters. Novels such as Light a single candle (Butler, 1962); Me, too (Cleaver and Cleaver, 1973); Listen for the fig tree (Mathis, 1974); Lisa, bright and dark (Neufeld, 1969); Twink (Neufeld, 1970); The boy who could make himself disappear (Platt, 1968); and Hey, Dummy (Platt, 1971) have gained wide acceptance among adolescents.

But attitudes and practices have undergone radical changes in the last few years and for this reason, the following bibliography includes materials published only during the years 1975-79. The bibliography includes fictional materials which depict a handicapped character as a main character or as a character central to the story. Several selection sources were used but the two used most extensively were School Library Journal and Booklist. Only materials published during the last five years were

included because it was believed that these materials would give a clearer picture of recent developments regarding the handicaps written about, the treatment of the handicapped in fiction, and the variety of the handicaps explored.

Surprisingly, handicaps in the areas of the emotionally disturbed, the physically handicapped, and the mentally handicapped were about evenly represented in adolescent fiction. Examination also revealed that treatment of the handicapped in today's juvenile fiction is accurate and realistic, and contains few pat answers or easy solutions; the day of the miraculous cure and the saccharin ending is gone. Instead, the toll that a handicap sometimes takes on family and friends is realistically portrayed as are the cruelties sometimes inflicted on the handicapped.

The only annoying characteristic encountered was the didacticism that was present in varying degrees in a substantial number of the books examined. The practice of using a thematic concern of this nature as a vehicle for a message is not a new one and fortunately, it seems that the practice is diminishing. Although there are only a few books in which the desire to teach completely supersedes the intent to tell a good story, the urge to inform is still apparent in many books.

The physically handicapped

Books in which a physically handicapped person is portrayed have been the most prevalent in the past and they continue to be well represented. Of the books containing physically handicapped characters, six contain characters who are blind, six who are orthopedically impaired, two who have cerebral palsy, and one who is deaf. It's difficult to say really why the blind and orthopedically handicapped are still the most prevalent handicaps protrayed. Needed in this area, it would seem, are more books which portray other physical handicaps.

Books portraying physical handicaps

Allan, M. The view beyond my father, Dodd, 1978.

Brancato, R. Winning. Knopf, 1977.

Brooks, J. The big dipper marathon, Dutton, 1979.

Dickinson, P. Annerton pit. Little, 1977.

Ferry, C. O Zebron Falls! Houghton, 1977.

Green, P. Walkie-talkie. Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Kent, D. Belonging. Dial, 1978.

Kingman, L. Head over wheels. Houghton, 1978.

Konigsburg, E. L. Father's arcane daughter. Atheneum, 1976.

Lawrence, M. Touchmark. Harcourt, 1975.

Safire, W. Full disclosure. Doubleday, 1977.

Savitz, H.M. The lionhearted. John Day, 1975.

Thompson, E. Hunter in the dark. Walker, 1979.

The emotionally disturbed

More frequently represented in recent years are portrayals of the emotionally disturbed. Approximately a third of the books examined portray a character with some degree of emotional disturbance. Disabilities represented include hysterical paralysis and the inability to speak as a result of hysteria, multiple personalities, nervous breakdowns, autism, psychotic behavior, and emotional withdrawal. A few of these novels are rather superficial in their treatment of the handicap, but most are excellent in their portrayal not only of the problems encountered by the handicapped person but by the problems experienced by the rest of the family in trying to cope with erratic behavior in the home.

Books portraying the emotionally disturbed

Beckwith, L. The Spuddy. Delacorte, 1976.

Carlson, D. Triple boy. Atheneum, 1977.

Dana, B. Crazy eights. Harper, 1978.

Dengler, M. A pebble in Newcomb's pond. Holt, 1979.

Duncan, L. Killing Mr. Griffin. Little, 1978.

Gerson, C. Passing through. Dial, 1978.

Griffiths, H. The mysterious appearance of Agnes. Holiday, 1975.

Guest, J. Ordinary people. Viking, 1976.

Heide, F. Secret dreamer, secret dreams. Lippincott, 1978.

Holmes, B. The whipping boy. Marek, 1978

Lee, B. It can't be helped. Farrar, 1979.

Neuman, F. The seclusion room. Viking, 1978.

Sallis, S. An open mind. Harper, 1978.

Spence, E. The devil hole. Lothrop, 1977.

Spencer, A. and Leech, J. Cry of the wolf. Westminster, 1977.

Wharton, W. Birdy. Knopf, 1979.

Wolitzer, H. Toby lived here. Farrar, 1978.

The mentally handicapped

Books which include a mentally handicapped character are more frequently encountered now than in the past, due perhaps to increased social acceptance of this type of handicap. The books written during the last five years in this area are, on the whole, very sensitively written. They are also very realistic in their portayal of the attitudes of friends and family.

A thread that seems to be running through a substantial number of these books is that even though impaired, many mentally handicapped people are still able to learn. Perhaps they are not able to learn as efficiently or as much as a nonimpaired person, but they do possess abilities that can and should be developed.

Another recurring message was that children or teenagers will generally match the expectations held of them. If a parent or a teacher expects little of a child, then little is produced. If more is expected, more is forthcoming. In other words, handicapped children, like other children, should be not only encouraged but expected to grow and develop to the maximum extent of their potential.

Books portraying the mentally handicapped

Albert, L. But I'm ready to go. Bradbury, 1976.

Bridgers, S.E. All together now. Knopf, 1979.

Brown, R. Find Debbie! Seabury, 1976.

Carpelan, B. Dolphins in the city. Delacorte, 1976.

Cummings, B.S. Let a river be. Atheneum, 1978.

Dexter, P.E. The emancipation of Joe Tepper. Nelson, 1976.

Hanlon, E. It's too late for sorry, Dutton, 1978.

Johnston, N. A striving after wind. Atheneum, 1976.

Mazer, H. The war on Villa Street. Delacorte, 1978.

Melton, D. A boy called hopeless. Independence Press, 1976.

Rodowsky, C. What about me? Watts, 1976.

Savage, E. The girls from the Five Great Valleys. Little, 1977.

Shyer, M.F. Welcome home, Jellybean. Scribner, 1978.

Smith, D.B. Up and over. Morrow, 1976.

Theis, D. The education of Steven Bell. Raintree, 1977.

Walsh, J.P. Unleaving. Farrar, 1976.

Conclusion

As stated earlier, the novels being written today are for the most part well written, sensitive, and realistic. Where earlier novels may have glorified or idealized a handicap, today's not only depict the struggles and the hardships of the handicapped person, they clearly show the struggle of family members, teachers, and friends to adjust to the handicap. Often, those close to the handicapped person cannot adjust, but even here, feelings and patterns of behavior are objectively examined with no judgmental overtones.

References

Butler, B. Light a single candle. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1962.

Cleaver, V. and Cleaver, B. Me, too. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1973.

Mathis, S.B. Listen for the fig tree. New York: Viking, 1974.

Neufeld, J. Lisa, bright and dark. New York: Phillips, 1969.

Neufeld, J. Twink. New York: Phillips, 1970.

Platt, K. The boy who could make himself disappear. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1968.

Platt, K. Hey, Dummy! Philadelphia: Chilton, 1971.

****

Administering Reading Programs: Using Research

by
Mildred Hoffmann
Reading Instructional Resource Specialist
Milwaukee Public Schools
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

When administrators of reading programs set policy, they usually take into consideration pupil needs, parents' concerns, staff input, consultants' recommendations, and reports of relevant research. It is this last consideration that is too often given unwarranted credence, since frequently, findings may be statistically significant, but of limited generalizability. Although researchers usually acknowledge the limits of generalizability, newspaper and magazine summaries of research often omit reminders of these constraints and consumers, in their eagerness to improve and progress, are prone to forget these limits.

A case in point is the 1979 study, "What Works In Reading," by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Public Schools. In their report, the authors suggest the limits of their findings when they state,

> Many legally implementable results emerged from the extensive empirical analysis which should be useful to educational policy makers in the School District of Philadelphia, and suggestive to other school districts. (Kean, Summers, Raivetz, and Farber, 1979)

Their summary remarks remind readers that the study was done only with the fourth grade students in the School District of Philadelphia. They warn that, "one should be careful in concluding that all

of the findings would be exactly the same for first graders or twelfth graders," and that while the study has shown what is effective with fourth graders in Philadelphia's Public Schools, "It remains for others to test the hypothesis in other school districts." (Kean, et. al., 1979)

The fifty-one page study cited above was summarized in the July 2, 1979, issue of Education USA under the headline, "NEW STUDY FINDS WHAT WORKS IN READING". The three page Education USA summary of the study was further condensed in the September, 1979, KAPPAN. In neither article were the caveats and methodology of the original report repeated. This may appear innocuous by itself; however, when research is highlighted in a publication such as Education USA, the audience is diverse, the dissemination potential is enormous and sometimes the practical origins of the research mask the limits of generalizability to other populations. An indication of the dissemination potential of this weekly newspaper published by the National School Public Relations Association may be inferred from this partial list of Education USA's cooperating organizations:

American Association of School Administrators
American Association of School Librarians
Association for Curriculum and Development
Council of Chief State School Officers
Association of School Business Officials of the United States and Canada
National Council of Parents and Teachers.

For administrators of reading programs, who probably will be future recipients of summaries of the Education USA article, the following background information may be helpful. It appears that the econometric techniques used in this study are the same as those used in the 1975 Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Study of achievement growth in the Philadelphia Schools. The 1975

> ...effort was widely acclaimed, especially by economists, but was criticized from within the School District of Philadelphia. Objections were raised on both a technical and an emotional level. After a period of heated interaction, it became evident that the School District

had no intention of utilizing this study for policy development or decision-making purposes. (Kean, et. al. 1979)

The current study is an outgrowth of a meeting called by the Deputy Mayor of Philadelphia. He invited the Superintendent of Schools of Philadelphia and the President of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia to discuss the recently released (1975) study. Both brought members of their staffs to the meeting and an agreement was reached for a follow-up study using, as a base, the methodology employed by the Federal Reserve Bank, but integrating within it the concerns and learning priorities of the School District.

This background information is offered to demonstrate the reluctance of many educators, including those in Philadelphia, to equate correlation with causation. It serves as a warning to reading program administrators who are tempted to base future policy making decisions on summaries of the Philadelphia study or any summary that omits facts and ignores methodology. It is hoped that administrators of reading programs will question the acceptability of multiple regression analysis as a basis for making educational decisions simply because economists suggest that it is the best information available. Administrators who want to use research findings for modifying their policy, curriculum, or program must insist on the resources necessary to enable them to examine the original research, to determine the appropriateness of the methodology, and to state the degree to which the findings are generalizable to their schools.

Administrators of reading programs may need assistance from research personnel to provide further clarification of findings and to help determine the limits of inference. For example, the administrators in the Philadelphia School District may require additional research assistance to clarify the following conflicting interpretations of the relationship between class size and the reading achievement growth. One author of the study appears to see relevance in the finding that in every class of 24-35 pupils, those in larger classes experience more growth than pupils in smaller classes.

That finding "is startling," said former Federal Reserve Bank economist Anita

> Summers, who is now a professor at the Wharton School of the U. of Pennsylvania and one of the authors of the study. "But we ran it over and over again and it always came out the same." (Education USA, July 2, 1979)

A different view of the same data is presented by Michael H. Kean, the major author of the study and the research director of the Philadelphia Schools. He discounts the finding regarding class size and reading achievement growth, and suggests that it is a mistake to take that statement at face value. According to Kean, the largest group studied had 35 pupils and the smallest had 24 pupils. He states that, "To conclude that 11 children more or less made a difference is 'nonsense'." (ASCD News Exchange, 1979)

Some policy-makers would also need consultation with research personnel to clarify terminology. For example, this explanation of the statistical analysis of class-size data in the Philadelphia study may warrant discussion between administrators and research personnel:

> The class size debate must continue on. In this study, the evidence is that students do better in larger classes (line 35). Alternative specifications--nonlinear and interactive--were extensively explored. But the finding remains! Certainly, many studies point to the opposite finding, but others have found the same one. In interpreting the finding, however, it is important to emphasize that it is a finding which emerges when many other variables are controlled--that is, what the positive coefficients are saying is that larger classes are better, after controlling for such instructional characteristics as the degree of individualization in teaching reading. (Kean, et. al., 1979)

If administrators of reading programs do not have the research resources necessary to interpret and clarify research findings, then they are subject to the consequences of blindly accepting recommendations such as these proposed by Anita Summers in

Education USA (July 2, 1979):

> The study has significant policy implications at local, state and federal levels ...She called for a change in Title I formulas that would channel funds to schools with low achievers, rather than just to schools with low socio-economic populations. She said inservice courses should be retooled to deal more with the principals' knowledge of and interest in the field of reading and to deal less with taking teachers out of class during the school day.
>
> And, she said, school districts should take a long, hard look at teacher absentee policies, the use of reading aides, the time a principal spends in the classroom and the amount of daily sustained silent reading in the schools.

If school personnel do not have the resources necessary for careful analysis of research findings, they may find themselves making decisions based on incomplete information as reported in summaries of summaries. For example, in the KAPPAN summary of the Education USA summary it is reported that,

> The linguistic basal approach (a combination of phonics and the old "Dick and Jane" basal method) is "head and shoulders" ahead of any other method of reading instruction. (KAPPAN, 1979)

Compare this to the information given in Education USA:

> A question left unanswered is what reading method works best with the lowest achievers. Although the study's most forceful finding was the success, overall, of the linguistic basal approach to reading compared with traditional basal, programmed, linguistic and specific skills approaches, the researchers cautioned that the lowest achieving students studied "were not helped more by one type of program than another." They were experiencing achievement growth at the same rate as their higher level counterparts, the researchers

> said, but although the ones using the linguistic basal approach were doing slightly better, that method was not significantly better than any of the others.

The reader will notice that the KAPPAN summary neglected to tell readers that the Linguistic Basal approach was superior for ONLY the middle and upper achieving students. It also neglected to define the term, "reading achievement growth." In order to understand the Philadelphia study it is necessary to consider the following:

> One significant finding was that whether the pupil came from a lower or a higher income neighborhood, or whether a school had more or fewer pupils from low income neighborhoods, made no difference in reading achievement growth. Researchers pointed out, however, that what was being measured was the rate of achievement. It is obvious from a review of test scores, they said, that pupils with low socio-economic backgrounds tend to have lower reading achievement levels as they enter the fourth grade.
>
> What the findings reveal, they said, is that low achievers can gain ground just as fast as high achievers, even though they may never actually catch their higher achieving classmates in the overall level of reading achievement. "The gray matter is there," said one of the authors of the report, Anita Summers. The problem, she said, is that given the initial gap in achievement levels, it is extremely difficult, statistically, for the low achiever ever to catch up.
> (Education USA, July 2, 1979)

It is hoped that these examples will cause administrators of reading programs to pause and ponder before accepting minimal information reports of research, and that they will question methodology as well as findings. When considering methodology, administrators are reminded not to equate correlation with causation and, further, they are strongly urged to proceed with caution when using research findings based on multiple

regression analysis. Since we should learn from experience, policy makers will want to examine correlational findings in the context of their experience, for sometimes an examination of the factors that "make a difference" and those that "do not make a difference" leads to further confusion rather than greater understanding. For example, in the Philadelphia study (Kean et. al, 1979) the researchers found that, "having a principal who frequently observes reading classes" was a variable that contributed to reading achievement growth, however, "whether or not the teacher receives feedback from the principal after observations" made no significant difference in reading achievement growth. What are the practical implications of these findings? Likewise, what does it mean when "spending time reading independently" and "having more direct contact with the classroom reacher" were found to be variables that contributed to reading achievement growth, however, the "minutes of reading per day" made no significant difference?

The intent of this review is not to suggest that administrators of reading programs ignore research when setting policy, but rather to encourage all policy makers to use research, demand maximum information relative to the findings and methodology, and to be cognizant of the limits of generalizability. Readers are encouraged to review reports of the Philadelphia study in the articles mentioned. However, for greater understanding the reader should send for the fifty-one page report. A single free copy of the publication is available from:

Office of Research and Evaluation
The School District of Philadelphia
Twenty-first Street and the Parkway
Philadelphia, PA 19103

References

Kean, M., Summers, A., Raivetz, M.J., Farber, I.J. What works in reading? School District of Philadelphia, 1979, 1-51.

New study finds what works in reading. Education USA, July 2, 1979, 21, 329-331.

What's the best way to teach reading? Here's a surprise. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 61, 3-4.

Study says reading better in large classes; author discounts finding. ASCD News Exchange, 1979, 21.

PARENTS' SPOT:

Parent Involvement With Accelerated Learners

by

Jean McEwen Milfred
Instructor
Ames Teacher Education Center
University of Wisconsin--River Falls

Parents frequently ask teachers for ideas and activities which will nurture the development of reading growth in accelerated learners. Since parental involvement and support are important keys to positive school experiences for children, educators are anxious to offer guidelines and suggestions for parents to follow as they work with their children. This article will outline behavioral characteristics which seem to be exhibited by children of superior ability, activities which parents may do with children at home, and bibliographic materials which may serve as a resource to parents who wish to pursue the study of accelerated learners.

There are behaviors in young children which parents may recognize as signs of superior ability. Using the research of Paul A. Witty, Grotberg (1971) states that early identification and parental understanding of the child's nature and needs are important to later development. Witty suggests that the signs of superior ability may be observed in most high potential children when they are very young. Some of the behaviors Witty (1971) memtions are:

1. The early use of a large vocabulary, accurately employed.

2. Language proficiency - the use of phrases and entire sentences at a very early age, and the ability to tell or reproduce a story at an early age.
3. Keen observation and retention of information about things observed.

4. Interest in or liking for books--later enjoyment of atlases, dictionaries, and encyclopedia.

5. Early interest in calendars and clocks.

6. The ability to attend or concentrate for a longer period than is typical for most children.

7. Demonstrations of proficiency in drawing, music and other art forms.

8. Early discovery of cause-and-effect relationships.

9. The early development of ability to read.

10. The development of varied interests.

The above list is by no means complete or all-inclusive. More extensive information on the characteristics of children with superior ability may be found in the work of Gallagher (1975).

All children, whether identified as gifted or not, need and benefit from creative, stimulating activities at an early age. One of the most pragmatic sets of ideas and activities which parents may consider for use with their children is discussed by Koppman (1978). Her suggestions are appealing because they focus on active parent involvement as opposed to passive parent presentation. The cornerstone of Koppman's plan is that parents spend time with their children. Although it is recognized that demands on the parent's time are great, Koppman proposes that children need undivided attention for some part of each day in order to flourish.

Although spending time with children is important, how that time is used is even more important. By providing quality interaction between parent and child, the value of the time spent is enhanced. Koppman (1978) suggests activities that not only promote parent-child interaction but also develop skills. Examples of such activities include:

Talking to Children - Children learn to speak by listening to the models in their environment. Infants hear sounds and attempt to replicate them. Parents reinforce such behavior with joyful

enthusiasm. Thus parents become the primary models for their child's speech and have a strong influence on the development of vocabulary, sentence structure, accuracy in usage, fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration.

Parents may act as models and nurture the development of these skills by:

- speaking with their child in complete sentences
- presenting details when their child asks a question
- using many descriptive words
- using correct word usage
- identifying objects with a variety of names: cracker, Triscuit, saltine
- openly expressing and identifying feelings: happy, sad, excited, depressed, nervous, joyful, worried

Listening to Children - Through listening, parents help their child develop the abilities to talk and to listen. By listening and attending to the child, parents may demonstrate that they value the child's ideas and language use. This, in turn, may increase the child's self-esteem and promote his/her attempts to interact and become a creative language user. Children who learn to listen in the home increase the probability that they will be ready to listen at school. For many children, listening is fundamental to learning.

Koppman suggests that parents establish a special time to listen attentively to each child. A brief segment of even three to five minutes is enough to help the child. Parents may encourage the development of listening skills by:

- listening to plans for the coming day during the early morning hours
- hearing about the latest sandbox invention at mid-day
- sharing thoughts after a bedtime story

Reading to Children - Children who have been read to become better readers. The interested parent or teacher is referred to the research of Chomsky (1972) for elaboration. However, children not only

need to know how to read but also need to want to read. Parents may model positive reading behaviors by:

- reading on a daily basis
- providing a library at home
- giving books as birthday and holiday gifts
- reading aloud street signs, billboards, directions, labeling information
- providing newspapers and magazines

For additional ideas and suggestions, Gowan and Torrance (1971) and Witty (1971) may be helpful.

This article has recognized that parents play a critical role in the development of reading growth in accelerated learners. The profile of behavioral traits of such learners and the ideas and activities which stress parent-child interaction will hopefully provide assistance to parents. However, these suggestions are by no means comprehensive. The following sources may be of interest to parents and teachers.

A Bibliography for Parents

Baldewicz, JoAnne, and Findley, Linda. The Gifted and Talented: Parent Involvement (Monograph #3). Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Presents guidelines parents may follow to establish parent groups at the district level.

Butterfield, Sherri (Ed.). The Whole Classroom. Del Mar, California: The Whole Classroom Publishing Group, Inc., 1978.

A pull-apart bimonthly sourcebook full of ideas and suggestions that may be done any where and at any time.

Gallagher, James J. Teaching the Gifted Child (Second Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1975.

A comprehensive discussion of issues in education and the gifted child.

Grost, Andrey. Genius-in-Residence. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Mother's story of her gifted child's experiences.

Krueger, Mark L. (Project Director). On Being Gifted. New York: Walker and Company, 1978.

Written by the participants in the National Student Symposium on the Education of the Gifted and Talented under the sponsorship of The American Association For Gifted Children. The talented authors talk about themselves--their dreams, accomplishments, frustrations and failures.

Labuda, Michael (Ed.). Creative Reading for Gifted Learners: A Design for Excellence. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1974.

Text presents overview of issues in gifted education and reading.

Readings in Gifted and Talented Education. Guilford, Connecticut: Special Learning Corporation, 1978.

A selection of readings on the psychology and education of children with superior ability.

Witty, Paul A. (Ed). Reading for the Gifted and the Creative Student. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1971.

An easy to read booklet dealing with parents, teachers and children.

References

Chomsky, Carol. "Stages in language development and reading exposure," Harvard Educational Review, 42: (no. 1) February 1972, 1-33.

Gallagher, James J. Teaching the gifted child (Second Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

Gowan, John Curtis, and Torrance, E. Paul (Eds.) Educating the ablest. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Grotberg, Edith H. "The role of the parent of gifted and creative children" in Paul A. Witty (Ed.). Reading for the gifted and the creative

student. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1971, 35-36.

Koppman, Patricia S. "Beginning with parents," The whole classroom, 1978, 5-6.

Witty, Paul A. (Ed.) Reading for the gifted and the creative student. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1971.

****

RESEARCH UPDATE:

Individual Differences in Reading Ability

by

Doug Vance
Reading Consultant
Madison East High School

Do atypical learners employ different cognitive processes when reading? Teachers of reading are familiar with a wide range of individual differences among students. These differences are usually ascribed to general intelligence and/or motivational factors. But some contend that individual differences are due to different cognitive processes. Recently, there has been research in two areas which has shed some light on this controversy. These two areas are gifted rapid readers and poor comprehenders. In both cases these atypical readers do not differ from their "normal" counterparts in intelligence or any other measure except reading ability. Do they take in the same amount of information when reading? And do they process the information in the same way?

It has long been noted (e.g., Huey, 1908) that rapid readers make fewer eye fixations per line than average readers, but take the same amount of time per fixation. Thus, it was assumed that fast readers were able to take in more information per fixation. Gilbert (1959) conducted an experiment where short sentences were presented in a single fixation to readers of differing abilities, and found that fast readers were able to report back more of the sentences than slower readers.

Jackson and McClelland (1975) set out to discover what information naturally fast readers (400 to 800 words per minute) do pick up. They found that there were no differences in the ability to perceive single elements such as letters or words, nor was the width of the visual span any different. But when several letters or words were presented faster readers were able to report more and were more accurate. This effect was true for unrelated strings

of letters, and was more pronounced for meaningful letter strings such as words or phrases. Jackson and McLelland concluded that visual input for a single fixation is approximately the same for both groups, but faster readers are able to encode more information, and are able to use their knowledge of language structure, spelling patterns, context and semantics to integrate the incoming information faster. Therefore, faster readers require fewer fixations.

Jackson and McLelland (1979) conducted an additional set of experiments to determine what causes individual differences. They looked at three conditions: the ability to recognize same vs. different random dot patterns, upper and lower case letters (a,A vs. a,B), and homophones (peen, pean vs. pren, pran). They found that fast readers actually took slightly longer to compare dot patterns, but they were faster comparing letters, and much faster comparing homophones. They concluded that fast readers do not differ in amount of information processing (dot patterns) but have faster access to letter-code information.

Recent research in theoretical models of reading could help to account for these differences. Massaro (1975) and Rumelhart (1977) claim that reading is an interactive process based on a hierarchical organization of subprocesses. First the reading material is analyzed for visual features, then letters, morphemes, words, syntax, semantics, and concepts. LaBerge and Samuels (1974) argue that each level must become automatic before the next level can apply. A reader has only a certain amount of attention to give. The beginning reader must give the greatest amount of attention to feature detection and letter recognition. As these processes become more automatic word concepts become the focus of attention. Even the most advanced reader may be slowed to a crawl when trying to figure out the symbols or words in a technical article. The beginning reader reading a familiar experience story may be able to "read" at the concept level.

Jackson and McLelland's research indicates that even feature and letter detection processes are more automatic for faster readers. Frank Smith (1978) maintains that speed of decoding is essential for meaningful reading. The slow reader, bogged down with too much featural detail, is unable to put it

all together into a meaningful pattern. "Slow reading interferes with comprehension and learning because it overloads the visual system and memory." (p. 179)

Perfetti (1977) argues that reading comprehension consists of two components: language comprehension and decoding. He and his associates have conducted a number of experiments to show that individual difference in these two areas lead to differences in comprehension. Perfetti used good and poor readers who are matched for intelligence so that reading ability is their only difference. In one experiment he tested language comprehension using a modification of a digit span task. He first presented a string of numbers (8, 5, 7, 6, 3, 5, 2, 4, 9, 3, 7) and on the last digit (7) the student was asked to remember the number that followed it in the string (6). He varied the number of digits between the target and the final number, and found that there was no difference between good readers and poor readers on this task. He then presented the same experiment except that he used words in sentences instead of numbers. Sometime the target word would appear in the same clause and sometimes it would be in a previous clause. He found that the good readers did significantly better at this task when the target word was in a different clause. He attributes this difference to superior language memory in good readers.

Perfetti and Hogaboam (1975) conducted another set of experiments to determine differences in decoding skills. Again using good and poor readers matched for intelligence the experimenters timed students while matching words. When the words were highly familiar both groups performed about the same. But as words became increasingly less familiar poor readers took much longer than good readers. Even when given training in recognizing the unfamiliar words poor readers were much slower than good readers. Perfetti and Hogaboam concluded that the skill of decoding letter sequences is better developed in good readers, and that this ability is basic to good comprehension.

Lesgold and Perfetti (1978) argue that speed of decoding is important to comprehension because of the limits of attention and capacity for processing. The poor reader is slower at decoding and has less general language facility. The longer it takes to read a sentence and the more attention given to decoding,

the greater the likelihood that the new information will be forgotten before it is integrated into the reader's store of existing information. Thus reading is like a balancing act, where all of the subprocesses must be in balance.

Research in individual differences in reading suggests that there are certain language and decoding abilities specific to reading which affect the speed and therefore the comprehension of written material. Research by Hogaboam and Perfetti (1978) does indicate that specific training can have an effect on increasing decoding speed among poor readers. The effects of this training were found to last at least ten weeks. It has yet to be determined whether training in decoding skills leads to improved comprehension, but according to Perfetti's model it should.

References

Gilbert, L. Speed of processing visual stimuli and its relation to reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1959, 55: 8-14.

Hogaboam, T.W. & Perfetti, C.A. Reading skill and the role of verbal experience in decoding. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1978, 70: 717-729.

Huey, E.B. The psychology and pedagogy of reading. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1968, originally published 1908.

Jackson, M. & McClelland, J. Sensory and cognitive determinants of reading speed. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1975, 14: 565-574.

Jackson, M.D. & McClelland, J.L. Processing determinants of reading speed. Journal of Experimental Psychology, General, 1979, 108: 151-181.

LaBerge, D. & Samuels, S.J. Toward a theory of automatic information processing in reading. Cognitive Psychology, 1974, 6: 293-323.

Lesgold, A.M. & Perfetti, C.A. Interactive processes in reading comprehension. Discourse Processes 1978, 1: 323-336.

Massaro, D. Understanding Language. New York, Academic Press, 1975.

Perfetti, C.A. Language comprehension and fast decoding: Some psycholinguistic prerequisites for skilled reading comprehension, in J.T. Guthrie (Ed.) Cognition, curriculum, and comprehension. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1977.

Perfetti, C.A. & Hogaboam, T. The relationship between single word decoding and reading comprehension skill. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 67: 461-469.

Rumelhart, D.E. Toward an interactive model of reading. In S. Dornic (Ed.) Attention and performance. Vol. 6. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.

Smith, F. Understanding reading. New York: Holt, 1978.

RESOURCES FOR TEACHERS

by

Hilda C. Baumgartner
Reading Teacher
Milwaukee Public Schools

Reading teachers who provide inspiration and develop positive attitudes are continually searching for new ideas that will help their students meet with success. The following publications are valuable teacher resources which provide a reservoir of ideas that are so necessary when planning reading activities for typical and atypical students.

The Acorn, a publication written for teachers by teachers, is filled with creative ideas and activities ranging from K through 8. It is printed on newsprint in newspaper fashion. The contents include ideas for spelling, language arts, math, reading, creative writing, bulletin boards, classroom cooking, learning centers, poetry, science, and social studies.

The Acorn
A Quarterly Publication
Cost - $8.00 per year
$15.00 two years
Order from: Bur Oak Press
Rt. 3, Box 209B
Platteville, WI 53818

The Good Apple is a newspaper publication for teachers from K through 12 consisting of approximately 100 practical, innovative skill building ideas per issue in the areas of language arts, science, math, art, social studies, creative dramatics, and vocabulary. The contents includes ideas for learning centers, bulletin boards, games, and other manipulative activities.

Good Apple Newspaper
Published 5 times a year

Cost - $10.00 per year
$18.00 two years
$24.00 three years
Order from: Good Apple Inc.
Box 299
Carthage, IL 62321

The Mailbox is a publication printed on a good quality paper in a 8½" x 11" magazine format. Its content focuses on center ideas, activity cards, file folder ideas, puzzles, bulletin board ideas, learning activities, patterns, and worksheets which are designed to be used by elementary teachers.

The Mailbox
A Quarterly Publication
Cost - $10.00 per year
$18.00 two years
$24.00 three years
Order from: The Mailbox
P.O. Box 9763
Greensboro, NC 27408

Readers willing to share resources with other teachers are requested to send their contributions to the editor.

PROFESSIONAL MATERIALS ON REVIEW

Reschly, Daniel J. Non Biased Assessment and School Psychology. Madison: Wisconsin. Department of Public Instruction, Bulletin 8572. August, 1978.

Reviewed by
James Raabe
Principal
Luther High School
Onalaska, Wisconsin

Since educational programs, grouping procedures, and special classes are often the follow-up results of pupil assessment, it is important that the assessment be non-biased so that the pupil is treated fairly. In this reprint of a paper first published for the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Dr. Reschly calls attention to current and past educational litigation dealing with assessment, particularly with claims of bias. The court decisions in this litigation could have far reaching effects upon school systems. After discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the underlying issues in the court cases, Dr. Reschly elaborates upon test bias. The final portion of the text deals with prerequisites for implementing nonbiased assessment and suggestions for specific changes in assessment procedures. School psychologists and others involved in assessment and followup procedures could well read this bulletin. There are some sobering thoughts contained in it.

Note: This bulletin should be available through local school administrators. There is but a limited supply available through the DPI.

****

Kaukauna Reading Improvement Projects March, 1979

Reviewed by
James Raabe
Principal
Luther High School
Onalaska, Wisconsin

As part of the Right to Read Effort the United States Office of Education funded the Kaukauna Reading Improvement Project (KRIP) which attempted "to improve the reading achievement of all Kaukauna elementary students through the improvement and refinement of student and teacher attitudes toward learning and reading comprehension."

This report contains a description of a number of projects developed by teachers in nine schools in and around Kaukauna. The introduction states, "Requests for single copies of projects will be honored by KRIP to the extent that the materials are readily mailable. Postage, duplicating, and handling costs will be charged." In order to request the projects one would need the 88 page booklet which summarizes them. There is no indication, however, where this booklet can be obtained. One might try the Kaukauna school district.

****

DPI Reading Newsline

by

Ellen M. Ryan
Reading Supervisor
Wisconsin Right to Read Effort
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

A number of people have expressed their feelings about the need for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction and the WSRA to coordinate information, activities and coming events that would be of interest to WSRA members. Therefore, the function of this column will be to improve the lines of communication and keep you informed.

Keeping in Touch

It is important that D.P.I. and the local reading councils continue to stay in touch and work closely together.

Department of Public Instruction reading consultants welcome opportunities to speak before your reading councils as well as school, parent and community groups. Currently popular topics are:

A Hop, Skip and Jump into Reading

Teach Kids First. Content Second.

Reading is Fundamental: RIF

Leadership: The Role of the Reading Specialist

RE: RIF

RIF is a federally sponsored program through the United States Office of Education that matches funds for the free distribution of paperback books to children. RIF stands for Reading is Fundamental with the emphasis on the FUN. It is highly motivating and has met with tremendous success in Wisconsin. This means that the government matched funds in the

amount of $101,844. A total of 57,855 Wisconsin children were served in the program and each child received a minimum of 3 free books of their choice during the school year which gives a sum total of 235,136 purchased and distributed. RIF is a fantastic way of establishing good public relations with the community. Please feel free to call me if you have any questions or would like to receive RIF materials or a proposal application.

COMING EVENTS:

Coming to Our Senses: An Awareness Seminar on Teaching Reading, Language Arts through the Environment

October 30-31, 1979 at Trees for Tomorrow, Eagle River

October 15-16, 1979 at McKenzie Environmental Center, Poynette Center

These two workshops are for any K-12 teachers who want some hands on experience in combining the teaching of reading, language arts and environmental science. Additional information can be obtained by calling the R2R office at 608-266-2799.

Reading/Language Arts Awareness Conference

December 4-5, 1979, Menomonee Falls

December 6-7, 1979, Wausau

The following ten nationally validated reading programs will be presented. If you don't have a K-12 developmental program that is meeting the needs of your school district, rather than trying to re-invent the wheel, why don't you bring your administrator to one of these sessions?

Project Title

Alphaphonics: Reading Readiness Training Program

ECRI: Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction

The Glassboro Right-To-Read Project

HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed

Learning to Read By Reading

Matteson Four-Dimensional Reading Program

New Adventure: Success Strategies for Reading and Language

Project R-3: Readiness, Relevancy and Reinforcement

RIPPS: Reading Instruction and Pupil Personnel Services

VRP: Vocational Reading Power

****

From the Editor

This issue of the W.S.R.A. Journal is being distributed to about 1,100 members. Diligent work by the membership committee, WSRA officers, and individual members has begun to pay off. Please continue to remove to membership form from each issue and pass it along to a colleague.

The editorial staff of the journal continues to adjust to the needs of our readers. We've added two new features--one devoted to the problems and activities of reading program administrators and the other dealing with reading news from the Department of Public Instruction. Read your journal and share it with other teachers, administrators, and parents.

Teachers working with poor or reluctant teenage readers will welcome a new publication titled, The High/Low Report. Published by Riverhouse Publications, 20 Waterside Plaza, New York 10010, this newsletter provides teachers and librarians with useful reviews of recent high interest-low vocabulary books. Thetis Powers Reeves, editor and publisher of the newsletter says, "It's our hope that this newsletter will be more than an aid in selecting books. We'd like to see it as a means of communicating with librarians, teachers, editors and publishers to broaden the understanding of this special kind of literature."

If future issues of the newsletter are as frank and practical as the first one, this publication will provide a unique service to reading educators. Subscription rates are pre-paid: $10.50 and billed: $11.50.

Suzanne Jund, Editor